Module: Introduction

Page: Introduction

CC0.1

Introduction
Please give a general description and introduction to your organization.

Nampak is Africa's largest packaging manufacturer and has manufacturing operations in 12 African countries as well as in the United Kingdom and Isle of Man. Nampak manufactures packaging products from metal, glass, plastic and paper including a range of high-quality toilet, facial tissue and feminine hygiene products, which are supplied to a wide range of customers. Nampak is the major supplier of plastic bottles to the dairy industry in the United Kingdom.

In the rest of Africa there are manufacturing operations in Angola, Botswana, Ethiopia, Kenya, Malawi, Mozambique, Namibia, Nigeria, Swaziland, Tanzania, Zambia and Zimbabwe. These operations service international beverage (alcoholic and non-alcoholic) and food markets (dairy, food services, fruit and vegetable, meat and poultry, snack food), as well as chemicals, tobacco, toiletries, household, industrial, healthcare and retail markets.

The Cartons and Labels division was sold during FY 2014 and hence the 2013 Scope 1 & 2 emissions data was restated to reflect the divestment.

The group is actively engaged in the collection and recycling of all types of used packaging. Nampak group services control head office, procurement, treasury and property rental activities and are based in Sandton, Johannesburg.

CC0.2

Reporting Year
Please state the start and end date of the year for which you are reporting data.
The current reporting year is the latest/most recent 12-month period for which data is reported. Enter the dates of this year first.
We request data for more than one reporting period for some emission accounting questions. Please provide data for the three years prior to the current reporting year if you have not provided this information before, or if this is the first time you have answered a CDP information request. (This does not apply if you have been

offered and selected the option of answering the shorter questionnaire). If you are going to provide additional years of data, please give the dates of those reporting periods here. Work backwards from the most recent reporting year.
Please enter dates in following format: day(DD)/month(MM)/year(YYYY) (i.e. 31/01/2001).

Enter Periods that will be disclosed
Tue 01 Oct 2013 - Tue 30 Sep 2014
Mon 01 Oct 2012 - Mon 30 Sep 2013

CC0.3

Country list configuration

Please select the countries for which you will be supplying data. If you are responding to the Electric Utilities module, this selection will be carried forward to assist you in completing your response.

Select country

CC0.4

Currency selection

Please select the currency in which you would like to submit your response. All financial information contained in the response should be in this currency.

ZAR (R)

CC0.6

Modules
As part of the request for information on behalf of investors, electric utilities, companies with electric utility activities or assets, companies in the automobile or auto component manufacture sub-industries, companies in the oil and gas sub-industries, companies in the information technology and telecommunications sectors and companies in the food, beverage and tobacco industry group should complete supplementary questions in addition to the main questionnaire.
If you are in these sector groupings (according to the Global Industry Classification Standard (GICS)), the corresponding sector modules will not appear below but will automatically appear in the navigation bar when you save this page. If you want to query your classification, please email respond@cdp.net.
If you have not been presented with a sector module that you consider would be appropriate for your company to answer, please select the module below. If you wish to view the questions first, please see https://www.cdp.net/en-US/Programmes/Pages/More-questionnaires.aspx.

Further Information

Module: Management

Page: CC1. Governance

CC1.1

Where is the highest level of direct responsibility for climate change within your organization?

Board or individual/sub-set of the Board or other committee appointed by the Board

CC1.1a

Please identify the position of the individual or name of the committee with this responsibility

(i) The job title of the individual or name of the committee
Risk and Sustainability Committee

(ii) A description of their/its position in the corporate structure
The Board appointed committee is chaired by an independent non-executive director and comprises of additional four independent non-executive directors. The committee meets at least twice per year and the meetings are also attended by appropriate senior executives and representatives of the internal auditors.

The Risk and Sustainability committee provides guidance on the overall sustainability processes for the group. This includes inter alia reviewing trends in sustainability practices that include climate change, defining the group's sustainability commitments, providing guidance on policy frameworks as well as monitoring

and reporting to the board on the group's progress against its sustainability commitments that include climate change and environmental issues.

CC1.2

Do you provide incentives for the management of climate change issues, including the attainment of targets?

Yes

CC1.2a

Please provide further details on the incentives provided for the management of climate change issues

Who is entitled to benefit from these incentives?	The type of incentives	Incentivized performance indicator	Comment
Management group	Monetary reward	Energy reduction target	Performance against energy usage targets forms part of the individual performance measures that determine the annual cash incentive bonus payments for senior management.
All employees	Monetary reward	Efficiency target	Individual key performance targets linked to the annual short-term incentive bonus are set at divisional level in support of environmental initiatives relating to a reduction in energy and water consumption, carbon emissions and waste as appropriate.

Further Information

Page: CC2. Strategy

CC2.1

Please select the option that best describes your risk management procedures with regard to climate change risks and opportunities

Integrated into multi-disciplinary company wide risk management processes

CC2.1a

Please provide further details on your risk management procedures with regard to climate change risks and opportunities

Frequency of monitoring	To whom are results reported?	Geographical areas considered	How far into the future are risks considered?	Comment
Six-monthly or more frequently	Board or individual/sub-set of the Board or committee appointed by the Board	Formal risk assessments are completed by each division in each country in which Nampak operates, i.e. South Africa, United Kingdom, Isle of Man, Angola, Botswana, Ethiopia, Kenya, Malawi, Mozambique, Namibia, Nigeria, Swaziland, Tanzania, Zambia and Zimbabwe.	3 to 6 years	

CC2.1b

Please describe how your risk and opportunity identification processes are applied at both company and asset level

At company level the Nampak Board approved risk management guidelines and operational framework is applied. These policies describe the group's risk management processes.

The Board mandated a Risk and Sustainability committee to:
• establish and maintain a common understanding of the risk environment, including trends and opportunities facing the group;
• monitor activities to ensure that key risks are identified;
• review and monitor the effectiveness of risk management arrangements and interventions;
• review that annual risk management plans are in place;
• review the group's risk register bi-annually and evaluate the appropriateness of mitigating actions and controls;
• review that unpredictable risks are identified as far as possible; and
• ensure the group's risk profile is within the approved tolerance framework levels.

The risk management plan for 2014 included reviewing the group's risk tolerance appetite framework, considering the top and emerging risks as well as monitoring the group's performance against material sustainability issues.

Risk management at an asset level include a compulsory process of identification and assessment of risks and opportunities, which are integrated into the budget and strategic planning cycles as well as in capital expenditure processes, which takes place annually. Each level of management, including the board of directors,

divisional directors and group functions, is responsible for regular appraisals of the risk environment in which the group operates, and to ensure that significant risks are identified, updated, assessed, managed, monitored and reported.

At divisional level cluster and divisional management are responsible and accountable for delivering sustainability plans appropriate to the impact of its own products from an economic, social and environmental perspective. Risk management is conducted by way of formal risk assessments completed by each division in each jurisdiction and for group functions.

CC2.1c

How do you prioritize the risks and opportunities identified?

Management has established a number of functions and processes to address and prioritize operational risk management and opportunities.

Formal risk assessments are completed annually at each division and group support function using proprietary enterprise risk management software. This structured methodology includes:
• identification and assessment of inherent risks with quantification, where appropriate
• a review of the mitigating opportunities or initiatives to reduce the impact of a particular risk
• assessing whether the risk has a likelihood of declining, increasing or remaining stable over the next three to five years
• the provision of a residual risk position.

The identified risks are reviewed at group level through a consolidated risk register. These residual risk scores guide the level of attention required from the group executive and the Risk and Sustainability committee.

Risks identified through the risk management process form part of the internal audit scope of review for the following year. This risk assessment process determines the estimated impact of the group's top risks worldwide.

Predetermined risk categories have been established to guide the operations in their risk assessments and flexibility is provided to add risk categories if required. Historical data is retained and performance can therefore be tracked and trend-lines established.

The group has established a risk appetite and risk tolerance framework. The measurement parameters used to determine the risk appetite is the group's EBITDA, and the risk tolerance is set against an appropriate interest cover ratio. Risk appetite statements in respect of social, economic and environmental, including climate change aspects, have also been agreed. The risk management framework also provides an outline of the potential financial impact on all risk categories, thereby ensuring that the level of financial risk exposure is taken into account when determining the residual risk outcome.

CC2.1d

Please explain why you do not have a process in place for assessing and managing risks and opportunities from climate change, and whether you plan to introduce such a process in future

Main reason for not having a process	Do you plan to introduce a process?	Comment

CC2.2

Is climate change integrated into your business strategy?

Yes

CC2.2a

Please describe the process of how climate change is integrated into your business strategy and any outcomes of this process

i) Nampak is considered to be a company with medium impact on the environment. Its major impacts come in the form of the use of raw material it purchases (such as paper pulp and fibre, tinplate, aluminium and various forms of plastics, silica sand, soda ash and limestone), the non-renewable source of electricity that is consumed and the management of post-consumer waste, reuse and recycling.

Nampak's environmental policy states its commitment to operating as an environmentally responsible company, and its belief that the integrated actions of its operations to conserve natural resources and protect the environment make business sense.

As a packaging supplier, Nampak is indirectly exposed to the same risks and opportunities as its customers. These are assessed and deliberated with customers at divisional level as the risks and opportunities could be different across the packaging material types.

Nampak strives to create packaging that is balanced in terms of providing product protection and preservation, is cost-effective, creates maximum consumer appeal and at the same time takes into account environmental responsibility.

Nampak therefore considers the environment in all business decisions and actions and promotes environmental awareness, both internally and externally, through proactive communications with stakeholders. Environmental aspects as well as the resultant effect on Nampak's operations are considered in all procurement decisions.

ii) Climate change presents both risks and opportunities for Nampak, a holding company with diverse interests in paper, glass, metals and plastics, and with 87 production facilities.

Climate change aspects, which influenced Nampak's business strategy include shortages or the availability of resources and severe weather events that could lead to logistics interruptions. The threat of energy shortages and outages coupled with possible taxes and increased costs influenced various energy efficiency initiatives. Changes in consumer behaviour and attitude towards more sustainable, less energy-intensive products have influenced Nampak's research and development of more sustainable packaging products.

iii) Nampak has adopted a dual approach to short term strategy changes. The first approach is to establish a Nampak-specific carbon footprint using the Greenhouse Gas Protocol.

The second approach is a lifecycle assessment process, which establishes the carbon emissions of packaging products from resource usage (cradle) to the customers' premises (gate) and can be further extended in conjunction with customers to include the filled product to the end of its lifecycle.

Water usage at Nampak is measured and targets are set with action plans to sustainably reduce water usage relative to the volume of product produced.

About 80% of Nampak's greenhouse gas emissions come from power consumption. The South African divisions had an overall target (in line with Eskom's target) to reduce Nampak's energy consumption by 10% between 2008 and 2013 in its continuous operations, which was achieved. In 2014 a new five-year target was set that requires a 10% reduction in energy intensity efficiency ratios by 2019 from a 2014 baseline.

iv) Long term strategy changes influenced by climate change relate to the development of sustainable packaging through continued group participation in extensive recycling initiatives and investment of significant time and resources into the development of innovative packaging that is lighter and has a higher proportion of recyclable content.

Nampak's significant research and development capability enables the company to respond to a changing consumer attitude and regulatory environment, as it allows Nampak to capitalise on movements in consumption patterns driven by environmental awareness.

v) Strategic competitive advantage can be obtained by balancing the generation of packaging waste, depletion of natural resources, the efficient use of energy and recycling which all has a positive effect on costs.

Shifts in consumer attitude towards more sustainable, less energy-intensive products present a business opportunity as Nampak manufactures several products that help businesses and consumers export to the European Union (EU).

vi) During 2013 Nampak invested R892 million to implement an aluminium producing can line at Bevcan Springs. During 2014 the two existing tinplate can lines in Springs and Rosslyn were converted to aluminium at a cost of R432 million. By migrating from tinplate to aluminium, scrap and spoilage waste can be reduced by 1.5%. Moreover, as aluminium has a higher value than tin plate, it is likely to have a positive impact on the Collect-A-Can recycling programme by giving an increased incentive to collectors and recyclers, as well as improve the overall environmental value chain.

For every kilowatt-hour of electricity Nampak Glass avoids using through increasing cullet over virgin raw material, about a kilogram of carbon dioxide is saved that would otherwise be released into the atmosphere.

When it comes to making new glass containers from recycled glass, 315 kilograms of CO_2 can be saved per ton of glass after taking into account the transport and processing.

During 2013 Nampak invested nearly R933 million in a third furnace at the Roodekop glass factory, which was commissioned in July 2014. The furnace consumes

natural gas during operations, which has the added benefit of diversifying the energy supply from electricity to natural gas resulting in reduced GHG emissions.

Water is required for the cooling system in the manufacture of glass bottles. To reduce Nampak's reliance on municipal water, a water harvesting system was installed during the construction of the third glass furnace in 2014. The closed-loop system has a 1 176kl water harvest tank, which filters out particles and other waste to a skip and circulates the water through the system for reuse. This eliminates the need for Nampak to continuously draw water from municipal sources.

The new furnace is targeted to save 15% on energy consumption, meet all the country's new air quality emission standards and reduce water consumption by up to 90% with a new closed loop water system.

CC2.2b

Please explain why climate change is not integrated into your business strategy

CC2.2c

Does your company use an internal price of carbon?

No, and we currently don't anticipate doing so in the next 2 years

CC2.2d

Please provide details and examples of how your company uses an internal price of carbon

CC2.3

Do you engage in activities that could either directly or indirectly influence public policy on climate change through any of the following? (tick all that apply)

Direct engagement with policy makers
Trade associations

CC2.3a

On what issues have you been engaging directly with policy makers?

Focus of legislation	Corporate Position	Details of engagement	Proposed legislative solution
Other: Waste Management Act	Support	Participated in discussion sessions on implementation of the Act, including proposals on pricing strategy.	A revised industry plan with sustainable solutions to increase recycling of post-consumer packaging waste to increase diversion from landfill.

CC2.3b

Are you on the Board of any trade associations or provide funding beyond membership?

No

CC2.3c

Please enter the details of those trade associations that are likely to take a position on climate change legislation

Trade association	Is your position on climate change consistent with theirs?	Please explain the trade association's position	How have you, or are you attempting to, influence the position?

CC2.3d

Do you publicly disclose a list of all the research organizations that you fund?

CC2.3e

Do you fund any research organizations to produce or disseminate public work on climate change?

CC2.3f

Please describe the work and how it aligns with your own strategy on climate change

CC2.3g

Please provide details of the other engagement activities that you undertake

CC2.3h

What processes do you have in place to ensure that all of your direct and indirect activities that influence policy are consistent with your overall climate change strategy?

Nampak is acutely aware of the impact that packaging products can have on the environment. The various divisional representatives engage and meet on a regular basis with policy makers, trade associations and industry bodies to debate and give recommendations on various topics including regulation, climate change and competition to ensure sustainability in their business models. Feedback on issues is reported as per the in the Nampak risk management guidelines and framework.

CC2.3i

Please explain why you do not engage with policy makers

CC2.4

Would your organization's board of directors support an international agreement between governments on climate change, which seeks to limit global temperature rise to under two degree Celsius from pre-industrial levels in line with IPCC scenarios such as RCP2.6?

No opinion

CC2.4a

Please describe your board's position on what an effective agreement would mean for your organization and activities that you are undertaking to help deliver this agreement at the 2015 United Nations Climate Change Conference in Paris (COP 21)

Further Information

Page: CC3. Targets and Initiatives

CC3.1

Did you have an emissions reduction target that was active (ongoing or reached completion) in the reporting year?

Intensity target

CC3.1a

Please provide details of your absolute target

ID	Scope	% of emissions in scope	% reduction from base year	Base year	Base year emissions (metric tonnes CO2e)	Target year	Comment

CC3.1b

Please provide details of your intensity target

ID	Scope	% of emissions in scope	% reduction from base year	Metric	Base year	Normalized base year emissions	Target year	Comment
Int1	Scope 2	100%	10%	Other: GJ per R1 million revenue	2014	132.66	2019	The target includes electricity consumption from all operations and takes into account future growth.

CC3.1c

Please also indicate what change in absolute emissions this intensity target reflects

ID	Direction of change anticipated in absolute Scope 1+2 emissions at target completion?	% change anticipated in absolute Scope 1+2 emissions	Direction of change anticipated in absolute Scope 3 emissions at target completion?	% change anticipated in absolute Scope 3 emissions	Comment
Int1	Increase	12.5	No change	0	Target relates to Scope 2 – electricity only.

CC3.1d

For all of your targets, please provide details on the progress made in the reporting year

ID	% complete (time)	% complete (emissions)	Comment

ID	% complete (time)	% complete (emissions)	Comment
Int1	0%	0%	Nampak has revised its target in 2014 to reduce its electricity consumption expressed as GJ per R1 million revenue by 10% over a 5-year period against a 2014 baseline.

CC3.1e

Please explain (i) why you do not have a target; and (ii) forecast how your emissions will change over the next five years

CC3.2

Does the use of your goods and/or services directly enable GHG emissions to be avoided by a third party?

No

CC3.2a

Please provide details of how the use of your goods and/or services directly enable GHG emissions to be avoided by a third party

CC3.3

Did you have emissions reduction initiatives that were active within the reporting year (this can include those in the planning and/or implementation phases)

Yes

CC3.3a

Please identify the total number of projects at each stage of development, and for those in the implementation stages, the estimated CO2e savings

Stage of development	Number of projects	Total estimated annual CO2e savings in metric tonnes CO2e (only for rows marked *)
Under investigation	8	
To be implemented*	10	950.32
Implementation commenced*	1	103
Implemented*	5	13096.93
Not to be implemented	5	

CC3.3b

For those initiatives implemented in the reporting year, please provide details in the table below

Activity type	Description of activity	Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)	Scope	Voluntary/ Mandatory	Annual monetary savings (unit currency - as specified in CC0.4)	Investment required (unit currency - as specified in CC0.4)	Payback period	Estimated lifetime of the initiative	Comment
Energy efficiency: Building services	Divfood - Replacing roof sheeting with Poly-Carb sheeting in Coil Shear (Vanderbijlpark) to reduce energy required for cooling.	74.16	Scope 2	Voluntary	21600	50000	1-3 years	6-10 years	

Activity type	Description of activity	Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)	Scope	Voluntary/ Mandatory	Annual monetary savings (unit currency - as specified in CC0.4)	Investment required (unit currency - as specified in CC0.4)	Payback period	Estimated lifetime of the initiative	Comment
Energy efficiency: Building services	Nampak Closures installed energy efficient lighting at Epping, Cape Town and the Olifants site to reduce energy consumption.	1063.23	Scope 2	Voluntary	905000	1342000	1-3 years	3-5 years	
Energy efficiency: Building services	Nampak Closures converted the variable speed drive (VSD) controls on its no 2 coating line to achieve energy consumption savings.	103	Scope 2	Voluntary	50000	77000	1-3 years	6-10 years	
Energy efficiency: Processes	At Bevcan Rosslyn the liquid ring vacuum pumps were replaced with more efficient Sullair vacuum pumps as part of the Aluminium Can Line conversion.	526.54	Scope 2	Voluntary	562000	2280460	4-10 years	6-10 years	
Energy efficiency: Processes	Bevcan converted its can producing lines in Springs from steel to aluminium resulting in large electricity savings.	11330	Scope 2	Voluntary	5940000	432000000	>25 years	21-30 years	

CC3.3c

What methods do you use to drive investment in emissions reduction activities?

Method	Comment
Financial optimization	Energy efficiency is taken into account

Method	Comment
calculations	
Partnering with governments on technology development	Nampak makes use of the Government's Section 12I tax allowance incentive as well as the Eskom Demand Side Management (DSM) subsidies and rebates where available to help defray the capital costs of equipment.
Other	During the procurement process and the submission of Capex applications for new equipment and projects, energy efficiency and savings are considered which include: • Specifying locally available control equipment so as to limit shipment of spares. • Purchasing recommended spares list to be delivered with initial delivery of equipment to limit transportation of spares. • Specify energy saving drive motors. • Considering new innovations, such as water based inks, to limit air emissions of Volatile Organic Compounds.

CC3.3d

If you do not have any emissions reduction initiatives, please explain why not

Further Information

Page: CC4. Communication

CC4.1

Have you published information about your organization's response to climate change and GHG emissions performance for this reporting year in places other than in your CDP response? If so, please attach the publication(s)

Publication	Status	Page/Section reference	Attach the document
In mainstream financial reports in accordance with the CDSB Framework	Complete	Sustainability Section – pages 59 to 67 of the Nampak Limited Integrated Annual Report 2014.	https://www.cdp.net/sites/2015/56/12656/Climate Change 2015/Shared Documents/Attachments/CC4.1/Nampak Integrated Annual Report 2014.pdf

Further Information

Module: Risks and Opportunities

Page: CC5. Climate Change Risks

CC5.1

Have you identified any inherent climate change risks that have the potential to generate a substantive change in your business operations, revenue or expenditure? Tick all that apply

Risks driven by changes in regulation
Risks driven by changes in physical climate parameters
Risks driven by changes in other climate-related developments

CC5.1a

Please describe your inherent risks that are driven by changes in regulation

Risk driver	Description	Potential impact	Timeframe	Direct/ Indirect	Likelihood	Magnitude of impact	Estimated financial implications	Management method	Cost of management
Carbon taxes	The South African 2013 Tax Budget announced a carbon tax at R120 per ton of CO2e above a basic tax-free threshold of 60 per	Increased operational cost	1 to 3 years	Direct	Very likely	Low	A carbon tax based on R120 per tCO2e increasing to R200 per tCO2e in 2020/2021 and calculated	Executive directors and senior executives at Nampak meet with the Industry Bodies who lobby the government	No direct costs are associated with government liaison other than staff salaries. The gas conversion

Risk driver	Description	Potential impact	Timeframe	Direct/ Indirect	Likelihood	Magnitude of impact	Estimated financial implications	Management method	Cost of management
	cent, which is to take effect from January 2016. It is planned that the proposed tax will escalate by 10% per annum until December 2020 - the end of the first phase of implementation. Offsets of between 5% to 10% will allow emission-intensive and trade-exposed industries to invest in projects outside their normal operations to help reduce their carbon tax liabilities. This translates into an actual carbon-tax cap of around R48/ton at the start of 2016. From 2020, the five-year phase 2 will be applied. The SA National Treasury released an updated carbon tax policy paper designed to help mitigate global climate change during May 2013 to						on Nampak's current Scope 1 emissions above the 60% basic tax-free threshold without taking into account additional allowances and offsets, is estimated to be an additional cost of between R6.5 – R10.5 million per annum for the first phase of the carbon tax scheme. The potential impact has been considered against the current operational spend of the company.	regarding new legislation such as domestic carbon taxes. Nampak provided its comments to the SA National Treasury Carbon Tax Policy Paper. Nampak is also managing the carbon tax risk by trying to achieve more efficient operations through behavioural changes, energy efficiency and the implementation of capital projects. For example, in anticipation of the introduction of carbon taxes the Corrugated paper plant since 2008 started switching to using natural gas (LNG) in boilers in place of coal to reduce Scope 1 carbon emissions. During 2013 Nampak Tissues and Corrugated started to purchase	project required a capital investment of approximately R8 million while steam to the value of about R35 million was bought during the year. This will be an annual purchase for at least the next 5 years.

Risk driver	Description	Potential impact	Timeframe	Direct/ Indirect	Likelihood	Magnitude of impact	Estimated financial implications	Management method	Cost of management
	allow for further consultation and commentary. Should this carbon tax be levied after the tax-free basic threshold of 60% of Scope 1 GHG emissions before allowances and offsets, it will add additional costs to Nampak's bottom line, which could impact on competitiveness.							steam from a third party instead of burning coal in boilers thereby reducing Scope 1 carbon emissions. These actions are not expected to affect the likelihood or magnitude of the risk.	
Emission reporting obligations	Currently there are no mandatory GHG reporting requirements in South Africa. However, the Minister of Environmental Affairs, has on 11 May 2015 published the Draft National Greenhouse Gas Emission Reporting Regulations and requested that written representations or objections be submitted within 60 days. The	Increased operational cost	1 to 3 years	Direct	Very likely	Low	Additional cost relate to penalties for non-compliance to submit GHG inventories and data which is estimated to be capped at R1 000 000. However, there is no potential financial impact for Nampak as current resources would be able to cope with the emissions reporting	Nampak appointed external consultants to determine its organizational carbon footprint as well as an independent third party to verify the carbon footprint inventory to ensure it is free of material misstatements. During 2013 the group automated the data collection process by implementing a software management tool,	Costs of about R350 000 per annum has been incurred relating to the appointment of external consultants to compile the carbon footprint and disclosure thereof as well as the external verification of the carbon inventory.

Risk driver	Description	Potential impact	Timeframe	Direct/ Indirect	Likelihood	Magnitude of impact	Estimated financial implications	Management method	Cost of management
	Regulations outline the requirements for mandatory reporting of emissions data for companies. In order to assess the carbon tax accurately, reporting of GHG emissions will be required together with verification of the reported emissions. This will place a financial compliance burden on Nampak, while non-compliance could be met with penalties. Emission reporting could lead to more stringent licence to operate criteria, e.g. for inclusion in the JSE Sustainability Index.						obligation.	making data collection and reporting more accurate. During 2014 the manual system of environmental data collection was replaced with a more robust systems approach. Nampak is now able to automatically generate reports, thereby providing management with real-time information on absolute energy usage and carbon emissions. The internal audit plan provides for the data to be checked for completeness and accuracy at source and in 2014 initial internal audits took place in paper operations. These actions are not expected to affect the likelihood or magnitude of the risk.	

Risk driver	Description	Potential impact	Timeframe	Direct/ Indirect	Likelihood	Magnitude of impact	Estimated financial implications	Management method	Cost of management
Fuel/energy taxes and regulations	The IPR 2010 is a 20 year electricity capacity plan to determine South Africa's electricity demand, how this demand will be supplied (e.g. by coal, renewables or nuclear) and what it will cost. The 3.5c/kWh levy that is charged for using non-renewable energy sources to cover generation costs for renewable energy was increased to 5.5c/kWh during the 2015 Budget Speech. During the 2015 Budget Speech it was announced that this additional 2c/kWh would be withdrawn when the current electricity shortage was over. However, the risk exists that this levy would not be withdrawn or could be increased in the future. In order to assist SA's	Increased operational cost	1 to 3 years	Direct	Very likely	Low	The 2c/kWh increase in the non-renewable energy levy will increase operational expenses by an additional approx. R11 million per annum whereas repealing the 5.5c/kWh levy would reduce electricity costs by approx. R30.5 million per annum.	Energy efficiency form part of daily operations and studies are periodically conducted to ascertain where operations can be more efficient to reduce energy consumption and related costs. During 2014 Nampak Closures installed energy efficient lighting at Epping, Cape Town and the Olifants site and modified the variable speed drive (VSD) controls on its no 2 coating line. These initiatives resulted in energy savings and cost savings including the energy levy, which will reduce the magnitude of the risk.	Nampak spent capital of approximately R1 342 000 on the lighting replacement and R77 000 to modify the VSD controls.

Risk driver	Description	Potential impact	Timeframe	Direct/ Indirect	Likelihood	Magnitude of impact	Estimated financial implications	Management method	Cost of management
	national power supplier (ESKOM) with electricity supply, demand-side management schemes are being rolled out to lower power consumption. Anticipated legislation relating to the Power Conservation Programme (PCP) could introduce penalties where the required power reduction is not achieved. Nampak's operations are very energy intensive and electricity outages could disrupt production while paying levies or penalties for energy consumption will affect costs and profitability. Power disruptions could also affect customers' demand for Nampak's products in South Africa.								

CC5.1b

Please describe your inherent risks that are driven by change in physical climate parameters

Risk driver	Description	Potential impact	Timeframe	Direct/ Indirect	Likelihood	Magnitude of impact	Estimated financial implications	Management method	Cost of management
Induced changes in natural resources	Nampak is considered as a company with medium impact on the environment and is reliant on the purchase and use of raw materials, non-renewable sources of energy such as electricity and various fuel sources as well as the management of post-consumer waste, reuse and recycling. With almost 80% of its carbon emissions emanating from purchased electricity, the risk of grid outages and shortages of energy supply	Reduction/disruption in production capacity	Up to 1 year	Direct	About as likely as not	Low-medium	5 days of disruption in operations at Metals and Glass nationwide due to power outages spread throughout the year before generators switch on to produce power could result in loss of revenue of about R100 million based on current revenue levels.	In order to secure consistent supply of power the Nampak divisions continuously engage with parastatals and municipalities and actively participate in forums that address supply issues with government and Eskom. Where it has been feasible, the energy supply has been diversified. Nampak invested in a third furnace at the Roodekop glass factory, which was commissioned in July 2014. The furnace consumes natural gas during operations, which changes the	Nampak invested capital of nearly R1.2-billion in the furnace at the Roodekop glass factory, including the UPS and the closed-loop water harvesting system.

Risk driver	Description	Potential impact	Timeframe	Direct/ Indirect	Likelihood	Magnitude of impact	Estimated financial implications	Management method	Cost of management
	will have an impact on operations and production in South Africa, the Rest of Africa and Europe. Nampak is at risk of being unable to meet customer demand due to power disruptions resulting in products being sourced elsewhere. The reverse applies where customers are unable to take stock due to their inability to produce product which results in lost sales.							energy supply from grid electricity to natural gas resulting in reduced GHG emissions. Along with the commissioning a state-of-the-art 20MW uninterruptible power supply (UPS) was installed to ensure an uninterrupted supply of power, which is critical to glass manufacture as it ensures avoidance of even momentary power lapses, dips and spikes. Water is required for the cooling system in the manufacture of glass bottles. A water harvesting system was installed during the construction of the third glass furnace in 2014.	

Risk driver	Description	Potential impact	Timeframe	Direct/ Indirect	Likelihood	Magnitude of impact	Estimated financial implications	Management method	Cost of management
								The closed-loop system has a 1 176kl water harvest tank, which filters out particles and other waste to a skip and circulates the water through the system for reuse. This eliminates the need for Nampak to continuously draw water from municipal sources. Nampak has various energy efficiency initiatives throughout the company to reduce energy and resource consumption, which will reduce the magnitude of the risk. Generators provide back-up power supply when required and is very costly.	

Risk driver	Description	Potential impact	Timeframe	Direct/ Indirect	Likelihood	Magnitude of impact	Estimated financial implications	Management method	Cost of management
Change in precipitation extremes and droughts	Extreme weather events such as floods or storms could damage facilities and the road infrastructure and impact Nampak's supply chain and the distribution of its products to customers worldwide.	Reduction/disruption in production capacity	>6 years	Direct	About as likely as not	Low	Damaged facilities and disruptions to the road infrastructure would result in disruptions in the supply chain impacting on continued operations as well as disruption in the distribution of Nampak's products to customers. A 1 week disruption in operations at Plastics UK could result in loss of revenue of about R43 million based on current revenue levels.	In order to mitigate disruptions to infrastructure from adverse weather events Nampak invested in an in-plant facility at Dale Farm in Ballymena, Northern Ireland, which became fully operational in August 2010. In July 2013 Nampak Plastics UK opened a new fully operational plant at its Dove Valley Industrial Park in Foston, South Derbyshire. The multi million pound investment has been three years in the making and has enabled all bottling machines to feed directly into the dairy, making the Dairy Crest site efficient. The machines have	Nampak invested capital of R150 million in the in-plant facility in the UK and invested R50 million in the in-plant facility at Midrand.

Risk driver	Description	Potential impact	Timeframe	Direct/ Indirect	Likelihood	Magnitude of impact	Estimated financial implications	Management method	Cost of management
								also been converted into 2 litre and 4 pint Infini bottles - Nampak's multi-award-winning lightweight bottle. An in-plant bottle manufacturer provides a lot of environmental benefits, such as reducing the cost of transporting empty bottles to dairies for filling. The risk of infrastructure disruptions in the supply chain is also mitigated while at the same time reducing carbon emissions. Nampak currently operates six out of its nine sites with this successful and sustainable in-plant model and during 2012 installed a beverage in-plant facility at Clover Clayville, South	

Risk driver	Description	Potential impact	Timeframe	Direct/ Indirect	Likelihood	Magnitude of impact	Estimated financial implications	Management method	Cost of management
								Africa. In 2014 a major plant supplying PET juice bottles was installed at a customer's factory in Midrand, supported by an eight-year supply agreement.	

CC5.1c

Please describe your inherent risks that are driven by changes in other climate-related developments

Risk driver	Description	Potential impact	Timeframe	Direct / Indirect	Likelihood	Magnitude of impact	Estimated financial implications	Management method	Cost of management
Reputation	Nampak's carbon footprint emanates from producing diversified packaging (e.g. glass, polyethyle	Reduced demand for goods/services	Up to 1 year	Direct	About as likely as not	Low	Nampak is a diversified packaging company so reputational risk is largely mitigated. The potential financial implication is difficult to quantify, but it will emanate from a loss of customer confidence and loyalty and higher operational costs for electricity, water, waste and resources. Nampak's 2014 brand value is estimated at R2532 million – according to brandfinance.com. An estimated 2% loss in reputation could result in a loss of brand value of approx. R50 million together with actual revenue.	In order to manage reputational risk Nampak is annually measuring, assessing and disclosing	Nampak spent about R350 000 per annum to appoint external consultants to compile

Risk driver	Description	Potential impact	Timeframe	Direct / Indirect	Likelihood	Magnitude of impact	Estimated financial implications	Management method	Cost of management
	ne terephthalate - PET, metal cans and paper packaging). For its continued existence and relevance it therefore has a responsibility to operate in an environmental friendly manner by balancing depleting natural resources, the efficient use of energy, packaging waste generation and recycling.						http://www.brandfinance.com/knowledge_centre/reports/brandfinance-south-africa-top-50-2014	its carbon footprint through the CDP. In 2014 the software management tool for environmental data collection was replaced with a more robust systems approach to enable automated reporting with real-time information on absolute energy usage and carbon emissions. For environmental credibility in	the carbon footprint and disclosure thereof as well as the external verification of the carbon inventory. Product stewardship and certification costs are considered part of operational spend.

Risk driver	Description	Potential impact	Timeframe	Direct / Indirect	Likelihood	Magnitude of impact	Estimated financial implications	Management method	Cost of management
	In order to manufacture the sustainable packaging products quality controls will be required to provide assurance of environmental stewardship for Nampak's customers as well as the end-users in South Africa, the rest of Africa and Europe.							operations and products Nampak has obtained product stewardship such as Hazard Analysis Critical Control Point (HACCP), an internationally recognised and scientific approach to the identification and control of hazards in food preparation, processing, manufacturing and use to	

Risk driver	Description	Potential impact	Timeframe	Direct / Indirect	Likelihood	Magnitude of impact	Estimated financial implications	Management method	Cost of management
								ensure that the food is safe to consume. The Plastics plants in the United Kingdom that produce packaging for foodstuffs conform to the British Retail Consortium Institute of Packaging standard, which is held and required by all the major retailers and brand owners. In South Africa 75% of operations are	

Risk driver	Description	Potential impact	Timeframe	Direct / Indirect	Likelihood	Magnitude of impact	Estimated financial implications	Management method	Cost of management
								certified in terms of ISO 14001:2004 that measure, monitor and communicate environmental performance. Assurance about the quality, safety and reliability of Nampak's products is provided through the ISO 9001:2008 Quality Management System certification as well as ISO 22000:2005 and PAS223. In 2014	

Risk driver	Description	Potential impact	Timeframe	Direct / Indirect	Likelihood	Magnitude of impact	Estimated financial implications	Management method	Cost of management
								Nampak Glass was the first company in South Africa to be awarded ISO 50001: 2011 certification - the energy management systems standard. These actions are expected to reduce the likelihood and magnitude of reputational risk.	
Changing consumer behaviour	Shifts in consumer attitude towards more sustainabl	Reduced demand for goods/services	1 to 3 years	Direct	About as likely as not	Low-medium	The potential financial impact will be a decrease in sales of specific packaging types and reduced demand for Nampak's products. An estimated 0.5% decrease in sales could result in a decrease of revenue of approx. R100 million per annum based on current revenue levels.	Nampak in 2014 supported the IPSA Student Gold Pack	Nampak provided sponsorship of about R40 000 for the

Risk driver	Description	Potential impact	Timeframe	Direct / Indirect	Likelihood	Magnitude of impact	Estimated financial implications	Management method	Cost of management
	e, less energy-intensive products could affect Nampak's product offering to its customers as well as the end-users worldwide. Customers are experiencing increased demand for the latest technology in order for them to remain competitive. Nampak has technical partnerships with packaging							competition by sponsoring the Judges Special Mention Prize that focused on waste management and recycling. Students were required to select any existing packaging in metal, glass, paper or plastic that they believe is not efficiently recycled in South Africa. They were challenged to re-design the packaging so that it	Judges Special Mention Prize Category of the 2014 IPSA Student Gold Pack Awards.

Risk driver	Description	Potential impact	Timeframe	Direct / Indirect	Likelihood	Magnitude of impact	Estimated financial implications	Management method	Cost of management
	producers internationally as well as has a Research and Development facility to enable R & D to keep pace with changing customer behaviour and consumption trends in order to deliver products with value-added advantages that improve living standards and lifestyles. The skills set comprises a highly trained							satisfied the functional packaging requirements of the product and ensured that it could be effectively and efficiently recycled as well. The winning entry focused on developing luxury packing designed for recycling while maintaining the appeal and quality associated with luxury products. A gift box	

Risk driver	Description	Potential impact	Timeframe	Direct / Indirect	Likelihood	Magnitude of impact	Estimated financial implications	Management method	Cost of management
	team of scientists, engineers, technologists and business information researchers utilising the latest, state-of-the-art analytical and design tools. To continue offering innovative packaging solutions Nampak will have to attract young graduates to the packaging industry, which is increasingly difficult.							for Russian Standard Gold Vodka incorporated mono material and a zero adhesive solution that reduced cost by 56% and manufacture cycle time by 24%. The paper materials used would be easily recycled with ordinary household paper waste while the amount of glass used in the bottle	

Risk driver	Description	Potential impact	Timeframe	Direct / Indirect	Likelihood	Magnitude of impact	Estimated financial implications	Management method	Cost of management
								would reduce glass used in manufacture by around 20 tons per year. The package is used in a unique way to educate consumers about recycling and ensure that the package is recycled. By participating in the IPSA competition students are afforded a unique opportunity to experience the world of	

Risk driver	Description	Potential impact	Timeframe	Direct / Indirect	Likelihood	Magnitude of impact	Estimated financial implications	Management method	Cost of management
								packaging and may consider pursuing packaging careers when they have completed their studies. This action is expected to reduce the likelihood and magnitude of the risk of providing continued innovative packaging for changing consumer behaviour.	

Please explain why you do not consider your company to be exposed to inherent risks driven by changes in regulation that have the potential to generate a substantive change in your business operations, revenue or expenditure

CC5.1e

Please explain why you do not consider your company to be exposed to inherent risks driven by physical climate parameters that have the potential to generate a substantive change in your business operations, revenue or expenditure

CC5.1f

Please explain why you do not consider your company to be exposed to inherent risks driven by changes in other climate-related developments that have the potential to generate a substantive change in your business operations, revenue or expenditure

Further Information

Page: CC6. Climate Change Opportunities

CC6.1

Have you identified any inherent climate change opportunities that have the potential to generate a substantive change in your business operations, revenue or expenditure? Tick all that apply

Opportunities driven by changes in regulation
Opportunities driven by changes in physical climate parameters

Opportunities driven by changes in other climate-related developments

CC6.1a

Please describe your inherent opportunities that are driven by changes in regulation

Opportunity driver	Description	Potential impact	Timeframe	Direct/Indirect	Likelihood	Magnitude of impact	Estimated financial implications	Management method	Cost of management
Fuel/energy taxes and regulations	Energy and fuel taxes will increase Nampak's operational costs substantially. However, energy savings will result in large operational costs savings. Compliance with energy reduction schemes (PCP) could reduce load shedding by Eskom resulting in less frequent disruptions in manufacturing operations reducing the need for diesel generators. These cost savings could add to Nampak's cost competitiveness in South Africa.	Reduced operational costs	Up to 1 year	Direct	Virtually certain	Low	The potential financial implications will emanate from energy costs savings. During 2014 the energy efficiency initiatives implemented reduced electricity consumption and related carbon emissions by approximately 11 850 tCO2e with cost savings of approximately R6.5 million per annum.	To benefit from fuel tax and regulatory opportunities Nampak has implemented the following energy efficiency initiatives during 2014. Bevcan converted the two existing tinplate can lines in Springs and Rosslyn to aluminium. By migrating from tinplate to aluminium at least 10% less energy is used in the manufacturing process as there is no need for any external base coating and its	The Aluminium Can Line conversion required a capital investment of R432 million that is estimated to have a lifespan of 20 years. The vacuum pump replacement required capital investment of R2.3 million.

Opportunity driver	Description	Potential impact	Timeframe	Direct/Indirect	Likelihood	Magnitude of impact	Estimated financial implications	Management method	Cost of management
								associated curing oven, only one spray bank is necessary (versus two for tinplate) and the conveying length is reduced by almost two thirds. Aluminium cans are infinitely recyclable and the energy required to recycle them is only 5% of the energy needed to produce virgin aluminium. If recycled enough times, aluminium cans become more energy efficient than any other form of non-returnable packaging. As part of the Aluminium Can Line conversion the liquid ring vacuum pumps were replaced with more	

Opportunity driver	Description	Potential impact	Timeframe	Direct/Indirect	Likelihood	Magnitude of impact	Estimated financial implications	Management method	Cost of management
								efficient Sullair vacuum pumps resulting in energy savings. Most divisions at Nampak have extensive plans to implement energy efficiency initiatives in the next few years aimed at reducing energy consumption and associated costs, carbon emissions as well as to expand operations to meet increased product demand.	
Fuel/energy taxes and regulations	Incentives or subsidies available for energy efficient equipment will reduce the capital costs of installing new energy efficient equipment to save energy consumption and add to Nampak's South African	Reduced capital costs	Up to 1 year	Direct	Virtually certain	Medium	The dti approved a section 12I allowance amounting to R550 million, which makes a substantial contribution to the capital cost of the new equipment and assisted Nampak in	During 2013 Nampak invested in a third furnace at the Roodekop glass factory, which was commissioned in July 2014. The furnace consumes natural gas during operations,	Capital investment in the third furnace amounted to nearly R933 million before the allowance.

Opportunity driver	Description	Potential impact	Timeframe	Direct/Indirect	Likelihood	Magnitude of impact	Estimated financial implications	Management method	Cost of management
	bottom line.						achieving its required hurdle rate for investment.	which has the added benefit of diversifying the energy supply from electricity to natural gas resulting in reduced GHG emissions. The new furnace is targeted to save 15% on energy consumption, meet all the country's new air quality emission standards and reduce water consumption by up to 90% with a new closed loop water system. The new furnace is a great example of a partnership between the government and private sector. The dti approved a section 12I allowance, which assisted Nampak in achieving its required hurdle rate for	

Opportunity driver	Description	Potential impact	Timeframe	Direct/Indirect	Likelihood	Magnitude of impact	Estimated financial implications	Management method	Cost of management
								investment.	

CC6.1b

Please describe the inherent opportunities that are driven by changes in physical climate parameters

Opportunity driver	Description	Potential impact	Timeframe	Direct/ Indirect	Likelihood	Magnitude of impact	Estimated financial implications	Management method	Cost of management
Change in mean (average) temperature	Higher ambient temperatures could lead to increased demand for beverages resulting in an increased demand for packaging. Nampak's beverage canning, polyethylene terephthalate ("PET") and glass bottling, closure and labels divisions would benefit from any increasing	Increased demand for existing products/services	3 to 6 years	Direct	More likely than not	Low-medium	The potential financial impact of an increased demand for Nampak's products as a result of higher ambient temperatures is difficult to quantify due to uncertainty, but an estimated 1% increase in revenue of the Metals and Glass division could result in additional revenue of approximately R95 million per	To bolster capacity Nampak in February 2014 acquired 100% ownership of a newly installed beverage can line business in Nigeria. Work has started on the installation of a second aluminium can line in Angola, with the conversion of the existing tinplate line to aluminium to start in 2015. Bevcan converted two existing tinplate	Converting the aluminium can lines in the Bevcan Springs and Rosslyn operations required capital of R432 million while the installation of the second can line in Angola required capital spend of R373 million. The third Glass furnace required capital investment of R933 million.

Opportunity driver	Description	Potential impact	Timeframe	Direct/ Indirect	Likelihood	Magnitude of impact	Estimated financial implications	Management method	Cost of management
	demand worldwide.						annum based on current revenue levels.	can lines in Springs to aluminium to boost production capacity and reduce scrap and spoilage waste by 1.5%. The new lines are able to produce at speeds of up to 2 500 cans a minute vs. 1 800 for older tinplate can lines. Nampak's third furnace at the Roodekop glass factory was commissioned in July 2014 and 48% of the raw material used in making glass (80 000 tonnes) was cullet, reducing energy consumption for glass production by 6.5%. Cullet or recycled glass is bought from 4 000 SMMEs and informal waste collectors which reduces the impact of waste	

Opportunity driver	Description	Potential impact	Timeframe	Direct/ Indirect	Likelihood	Magnitude of impact	Estimated financial implications	Management method	Cost of management
								on the environment. Nampak carried out physical glass-wall thickness measurements to gather data for the development of an accurate finite element analysis (FEA) model for the analysis of glass bottles. FEA was done to compare bottles produced by the Blow-Blow process to the lighter weight Press-Blow process resulting in at least a 10% saving in mass for glass bottles for tomato sauce and a 7% saving in mass for glass jars for mayonnaise.	
Induced changes in natural resources	Organisations are competing for natural resources, which are becoming one of	Reduced operational costs	Up to 1 year	Direct	Likely	Low	The availability of recycled materials as well as the proportion of the various	Nampak is directly involved in many recycling initiatives. Nampak has a Recycling	These activities constitute part of daily operations and levies paid towards the

Opportunity driver	Description	Potential impact	Timeframe	Direct/ Indirect	Likelihood	Magnitude of impact	Estimated financial implications	Management method	Cost of management
	scarcity. By using resources sustainably and minimising pollution through environmental efficiencies and recycling, Nampak can lighten its impact on natural capital. Using recycled and not virgin materials as feedstock not only reduces operational costs, but also contributes to resource preservation. Nampak is presented with opportunities for innovative solutions to changed packaging demands in South Africa, the rest of Africa and Europe.						resources recycled influence operational costs. Current trends show that the recycling of metals, glass, paper and plastic are increasing. A reduction in expenses of 0.5% of the Metals and Glass division could give rise to about R34 million additional profit per annum should more recycled glass and aluminium become available for production.	division whose the primary functions are to procure recovered fibre for the group paper mills and recovered cullet for the Glass division. In 2014 Nampak extended its recycling collection to PET, for use in the textiles industry and to other plastics, which are sold to recyclers. During the year the division collected 250 000 tonnes of recyclable materials. The recovered fibre was consumed as raw material to manufacture corrugated cartons and tissue for hygiene products. In 2014 about 48% of the raw material used in	recycling industry bodies amount to about R650 000 annually. Collect-a-Can is a joint venture between Nampak and steel manufacturer ArcelorMittal. From 1993 to 2013 the collective investment was R725 million.

Opportunity driver	Description	Potential impact	Timeframe	Direct/ Indirect	Likelihood	Magnitude of impact	Estimated financial implications	Management method	Cost of management
								making glass (80 000 tonnes) was cullet, reducing energy consumption for glass production by 6.5%. Cullet or recycled glass is bought from 4 000 SMMEs and informal waste collectors which reduces the impact of waste on the environment. Currently about 41% of all glass is recycled in South Africa (compared to about 37% in the USA). Industry body initiatives and recycling opportunities that Nampak participate in are: Metals - Collect-a-Can Glass - Nampak as founding sponsor of The Glass Recycling Company. Paper - The Paper Recycling	

Opportunity driver	Description	Potential impact	Timeframe	Direct/ Indirect	Likelihood	Magnitude of impact	Estimated financial implications	Management method	Cost of management
								Association of South Africa Plastic – PlasticsISA & Petco Over 72% of beverage cans in Southern Africa are recycled. As aluminium has a higher value than tin plate, it is likely to have a positive impact on the Collect-A-Can recycling programme by giving an increased incentive to collectors and recyclers.	

CC6.1c

Please describe the inherent opportunities that are driven by changes in other climate-related developments

Opportunity driver	Description	Potential impact	Timeframe	Direct/ Indirect	Likelihood	Magnitude of impact	Estimated financial implications	Management method	Cost of management

Opportunity driver	Description	Potential impact	Timeframe	Direct/ Indirect	Likelihood	Magnitude of impact	Estimated financial implications	Management method	Cost of management
Reputation	Nampak is committed to sound environmental stewardship and would like to be seen as a leader in environmental packaging supplying products that can help in the transition to a low carbon economy. The reputational benefits of being a sustainable brand and responsible corporate citizen will result in market growth	Reduced operational costs	Up to 1 year	Direct	More likely than not	Low	A reputation as a sustainable brand and responsible corporate citizen is reflected in the economic value Nampak creates and distributes to its stakeholders such as its employees and the local communities in which it operates. By increasing the recycled content cost are contained resulting in less pressure to increase prices. Nampak's 2014 brand value is estimated at R2532 million – according to brandfinance.com. An estimated 1% gain in reputational benefits could result in an increase in brand value of approx. R25 million together with actual revenue. http://www.brandfinance.com/knowledge_centre/reports/brandfinance-south-africa-top-50-2014	In order to manage and enhance Nampak's reputation as environmental leader Nampak supports initiatives which improve collection and recycling opportunities for its packaging products while providing education to the public regarding the benefits of recycling. Nampak's support for waste disposal in the Kruger National Park (KNP)	Nampak contributed capital in excess of R4 million to the MRF facility, of which R800 000 was spent on the truck that transfers the waste from the camps back to the facility for sorting.

Opportunity driver	Description	Potential impact	Timeframe	Direct/ Indirect	Likelihood	Magnitude of impact	Estimated financial implications	Management method	Cost of management
	and opportunities for expansion in South Africa, the rest of Africa and Europe.							dates back to 2006 when the first animal proof dust bins were installed to prevent baboons from rummaging through camps. In 2010, Nampak installed 150 new prototype bins allowing for separation of waste at source. A total of 400 bins have been installed in the southern area camps to date. During April 2014 a Waste Materials Recovery	

Opportunity driver	Description	Potential impact	Timeframe	Direct/ Indirect	Likelihood	Magnitude of impact	Estimated financial implications	Management method	Cost of management
								System Facility (known as the MRF) was installed at Skukuza Camp to allow post-consumer packaging waste that is collected from the camps to be sorted on-site, into various material types for recycling. The MRF is a closed loop system that allows processors to separate different waste materials on a conveyer belt. Baboon proof storage	

Opportunity driver	Description	Potential impact	Timeframe	Direct/ Indirect	Likelihood	Magnitude of impact	Estimated financial implications	Management method	Cost of management
								cages have also been installed at the facility and a truck was provided to transfer the post-consumer packaging waste from the camps back to the facility for sorting over the project period. Nampak trained KNP staff on the operation of the system to ensure maximum beneficiation. The MRF will provide Nampak with additional valuable raw materials,	

Opportunity driver	Description	Potential impact	Timeframe	Direct/ Indirect	Likelihood	Magnitude of impact	Estimated financial implications	Management method	Cost of management
								to be used downstream in the manufacturing process, reducing the amount of waste being disposed of in landfills.	
Changing consumer behaviour	Shifts in consumer attitude towards more sustainable, less energy-intensive products could affect Nampak's product offering to its customers as well as the end-users. Nampak understands that its packaging	New products/business services	Up to 1 year	Direct	Very likely	Low	The potential financial impact will be an increase in sales and demand for Nampak's products. An estimated 0.5% increase in sales of Plastics UK could result in an increase of revenue of approx. R11 million per annum based on current revenue levels.	Nampak continuously strive to introduce sustainable and innovative packaging products with increased recyclability and a low carbon footprint. Nampak Plastics UK continues to make progress with its light-weighted high-	R&D costs relate to staff costs, which are internalised while the Infini project required a capital investment of around £9 million on implementing the bottle range in addition to the £1 million spent on

Opportunity driver	Description	Potential impact	Timeframe	Direct/ Indirect	Likelihood	Magnitude of impact	Estimated financial implications	Management method	Cost of management
	products have the potential to reduce carbon emissions, providing a unique opportunity to support the transition to a low carbon economy. Nampak will therefore continue to explore innovative solutions to accommodate changed packaging demands in South Africa, the rest of Africa and Europe.							density polyethylene (HDPE) milk bottle – Infini® with a recycled content of up to 15%. Trials have shown that the recycled raw material content on both the Infini® and standard bottle ranges can be increased to 30% and Nampak is on track to meet the Dairy Roadmap's target of 30% rHDPE inclusion in packaging by 2015. However, this	developing the design. Nampak is providing sponsorship for the Fresher for Longer programme.

Opportunity driver	Description	Potential impact	Timeframe	Direct/ Indirect	Likelihood	Magnitude of impact	Estimated financial implications	Management method	Cost of management
								depends on the availability of a consistent quality and quantity of recycled material from suppliers. In 2014 Infini® was awarded the Farm Business Cream Award for Packaging that recognizes the Infini bottle as the world's lightest 4-pint (2.27 litre) 32g bottle, which contains up to 20% less material than a standard bottle, and up to 30%	

Opportunity driver	Description	Potential impact	Timeframe	Direct/ Indirect	Likelihood	Magnitude of impact	Estimated financial implications	Management method	Cost of management
								recycled HDPE. More than 800 million Infini bottles have been sold in the UK. Other dairy packaging products include a Cream Bottle, a light, re-sealable, leak-proof and easy-to-pour rigid plastic bottle – which independent research showed that many consumers preferred to a 'traditional' cream container. Nampak Plastics, with Ousedale	

Opportunity driver	Description	Potential impact	Timeframe	Direct/ Indirect	Likelihood	Magnitude of impact	Estimated financial implications	Management method	Cost of management
								School, have launched the Fresher for Longer education programme, led by the Global Action Plan, to educate secondary school students, their schools and parents to source, store, cook and dispose of food in an energy-efficient and environmentally responsible way.	

CC6.1d

Please explain why you do not consider your company to be exposed to inherent opportunities driven by changes in regulation that have the potential to generate a substantive change in your business operations, revenue or expenditure

CC6.1e

Please explain why you do not consider your company to be exposed to inherent opportunities driven by physical climate parameters that have the potential to generate a substantive change in your business operations, revenue or expenditure

CC6.1f

Please explain why you do not consider your company to be exposed to inherent opportunities driven by changes in other climate-related developments that have the potential to generate a substantive change in your business operations, revenue or expenditure

Further Information

Module: GHG Emissions Accounting, Energy and Fuel Use, and Trading

Page: CC7. Emissions Methodology

CC7.1

Please provide your base year and base year emissions (Scopes 1 and 2)

Scope	Base year	Base year emissions (metric tonnes CO2e)
Scope 1	Wed 01 Oct 2008 - Wed 30 Sep 2009	124064.11
Scope 2	Wed 01 Oct 2008 - Wed 30 Sep 2009	598782.89

CC7.2

Please give the name of the standard, protocol or methodology you have used to collect activity data and calculate Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions

Please select the published methodologies that you use
The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: A Corporate Accounting and Reporting Standard (Revised Edition)

CC7.2a

If you have selected "Other" in CC7.2 please provide details of the standard, protocol or methodology you have used to collect activity data and calculate Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions

CC7.3

Please give the source for the global warming potentials you have used

Gas	Reference
CO2	IPCC Fourth Assessment Report (AR4 - 100 year)
Other: R407C	IPCC Fourth Assessment Report (AR4 - 100 year)
Other: HCFC22 - R22	IPCC Fourth Assessment Report (AR4 - 100 year)
Other: R410a	IPCC Fourth Assessment Report (AR4 - 100 year)
Other: HFC134a	IPCC Fourth Assessment Report (AR4 - 100 year)
Other: R404	IPCC Fourth Assessment Report (AR4 - 100 year)

CC7.4

Please give the emissions factors you have applied and their origin; alternatively, please attach an Excel spreadsheet with this data at the bottom of this page

Fuel/Material/Energy	Emission Factor	Unit	Reference
Brown coal	2.84676	Other: kg CO2e per kilogram	Defra 2014 - Guidelines to Defra's GHG Conversion Factors for Company Reporting, Fuels, updated May 2014. Available: www.ukconversionfactorscarbonsmart.co.uk
Diesel/Gas oil	2.6691	kg CO2e per liter	Defra 2014 - Guidelines to Defra's GHG Conversion Factors for Company Reporting, Fuels, updated May 2014. Available: www.ukconversionfactorscarbonsmart.co.uk
Kerosene	2.53797	kg CO2e per liter	Defra 2014 - Guidelines to Defra's GHG Conversion Factors for Company Reporting, Fuels, updated May 2014. Available: www.ukconversionfactorscarbonsmart.co.uk
Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG)	2.72783	Other: kg CO2e per kilogram	Defra 2014 - Guidelines to Defra's GHG Conversion Factors for Company Reporting, Fuels, updated May 2014. Available: www.ukconversionfactorscarbonsmart.co.uk
Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG)	0.18497	Other: kg CO2e per kWh	Defra 2014 - Guidelines to Defra's GHG Conversion Factors for Company Reporting, Fuels, updated May 2014. Available: www.ukconversionfactorscarbonsmart.co.uk
Natural gas	2.0346	kg CO2e per liter	Defra 2014 - Guidelines to Defra's GHG Conversion Factors for Company Reporting, Fuels, updated May 2014. Available: www.ukconversionfactorscarbonsmart.co.uk
Liquefied petroleum gas	1.50225	kg CO2e per	Defra 2014 - Guidelines to Defra's GHG Conversion Factors for Company Reporting, Fuels,

Fuel/Material/Energy	Emission Factor	Unit	Reference
(LPG)		liter	updated May 2014. Available: www.ukconversionfactorscarbonsmart.co.uk
Liquefied petroleum gas (LPG)	2.94036	Other: kg CO2e per kilogram	Defra 2014 - Guidelines to Defra's GHG Conversion Factors for Company Reporting, Fuels, updated May 2014. Available: www.ukconversionfactorscarbonsmart.co.uk
Motor gasoline	2.2999	kg CO2e per liter	Defra 2014 - Guidelines to Defra's GHG Conversion Factors for Company Reporting, Fuels, updated May 2014. Available: www.ukconversionfactorscarbonsmart.co.uk
Steam	0.33966	Other: kg CO2e per kWh	Defra 2014 - Guidelines to Defra's GHG Conversion Factors for Company Reporting, Fuels, updated May 2014. Available: www.ukconversionfactorscarbonsmart.co.uk
Electricity	1.03	Other: kg CO2e per kWh	South Africa: Eskom Holdings SOC Limited Integrated Report 2014. Available: http://integratedreport.eskom.co.za/supplementary/app-environmental.php
Electricity	0.49426	Other: kg CO2e per kWh	UK: Defra 2014 - Guidelines to Defra's GHG Conversion Factors for Company Reporting, UK Electricity, updated May 2014. Available: www.ukconversionfactorscarbonsmart.co.uk

Further Information

Page: CC8. Emissions Data - (1 Oct 2012 - 30 Sep 2013)

CC8.1

Please select the boundary you are using for your Scope 1 and 2 greenhouse gas inventory

Equity share

CC8.2

Please provide your gross global Scope 1 emissions figures in metric tonnes CO2e

159489.31

CC8.3

Please provide your gross global Scope 2 emissions figures in metric tonnes CO2e

619785.15

CC8.4

Are there are any sources (e.g. facilities, specific GHGs, activities, geographies, etc.) of Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions that are within your selected reporting boundary which are not included in your disclosure?

Yes

CC8.4a

Please provide details of the sources of Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions that are within your selected reporting boundary which are not included in your disclosure

Source	Relevance of Scope 1 emissions from this source	Relevance of Scope 2 emissions excluded from this source	Explain why the source is excluded
Geographies – Ethiopia and Mozambique are excluded from carbon footprint	Emissions are not relevant	Emissions are not relevant	The number of employees and associated carbon emissions from operations in these countries are not considered materially substantial; hence it has not yet been included in the carbon footprint report.
Activity – Scope 2 (purchased electricity) in Angola	No emissions excluded	No emissions from this source	Electricity in Angola is produced by diesel generators. Scope 1 emissions are included, but Scope 2 emissions are nil.

CC8.5

Please estimate the level of uncertainty of the total gross global Scope 1 and 2 emissions figures that you have supplied and specify the sources of uncertainty in your data gathering, handling and calculations

Scope	Uncertainty range	Main sources of uncertainty	Please expand on the uncertainty in your data
Scope 1	More than 2% but less than or equal to 5%	Data Gaps Assumptions Extrapolation Data Management	Although great effort was made to ensure completeness and accuracy by using internal spreadsheets with controls and responsible parties; due to the large scope of the organisation, it is expected that some discrepancies could have occurred in the data collection and supply from the various divisional facilities of the company. Fuel consumed in owned equipment was derived from purchase records and not metered consumption. Data used to calculate the emissions from the vehicle fleet and forklifts consisted of litres of petrol and diesel and kilograms of LPG purchased. Air-conditioning refill gases consumed in Nigeria was not specified and therefore split between R410a and R22.
Scope 2	More than 2% but less than or equal to 5%	Data Gaps Extrapolation Metering/ Measurement Constraints	In South Africa electricity charges are based on meters owned and maintained (calibrated) by Eskom or the municipalities. Some countries and divisions have missing data and available data was extrapolated to reflect consumption for a full year.

CC8.6

Please indicate the verification/assurance status that applies to your reported Scope 1 emissions

No third party verification or assurance

CC8.6a

Please provide further details of the verification/assurance undertaken for your Scope 1 emissions, and attach the relevant statements

Type of verification or assurance	Attach the statement	Page/section reference	Relevant standard	Proportion of reported Scope 1 emissions verified (%)

CC8.6b

Please provide further details of the regulatory regime to which you are complying that specifies the use of Continuous Emissions Monitoring Systems (CEMS)

Regulation	% of emissions covered by the system	Compliance period	Evidence of submission

CC8.7

Please indicate the verification/assurance status that applies to your reported Scope 2 emissions

No third party verification or assurance

CC8.7a

Please provide further details of the verification/assurance undertaken for your Scope 2 emissions, and attach the relevant statements

Type of verification or assurance	Attach the statement	Page/Section reference	Relevant standard	Proportion of reported Scope 2 emissions verified (%)

CC8.8

Please identify if any data points have been verified as part of the third party verification work undertaken, other than the verification of emissions figures reported in CC8.6, CC8.7 and CC14.2

Additional data points verified	Comment
No additional data verified	Nampak's carbon footprint was restated due to divestment of the Cartons & Labels division.

CC8.9

Are carbon dioxide emissions from biologically sequestered carbon relevant to your organization?

No

CC8.9a

Please provide the emissions from biologically sequestered carbon relevant to your organization in metric tonnes CO2

Further Information

Page: CC8. Emissions Data - (1 Oct 2013 - 30 Sep 2014)

CC8.1

Please select the boundary you are using for your Scope 1 and 2 greenhouse gas inventory

Equity share

CC8.2

Please provide your gross global Scope 1 emissions figures in metric tonnes CO2e

153866.10

CC8.3

Please provide your gross global Scope 2 emissions figures in metric tonnes CO2e

648785.11

CC8.4

Are there are any sources (e.g. facilities, specific GHGs, activities, geographies, etc.) of Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions that are within your selected reporting boundary which are not included in your disclosure?

Yes

CC8.4a

Please provide details of the sources of Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions that are within your selected reporting boundary which are not included in your disclosure

Source	Relevance of Scope 1 emissions from this source	Relevance of Scope 2 emissions excluded from this source	Explain why the source is excluded
Geographies – Ethiopia and Mozambique are excluded from carbon footprint	Emissions are not relevant	Emissions are not relevant	The number of employees and associated carbon emissions from operations in these countries are not considered materially substantial; hence it has not yet been included in the carbon footprint report.
Activity – Scope 2 (purchased electricity) in Angola	No emissions excluded	No emissions from this source	Electricity in Angola is produced by diesel generators. Scope 1 emissions are included, but Scope 2 emissions are nil.

CC8.5

Please estimate the level of uncertainty of the total gross global Scope 1 and 2 emissions figures that you have supplied and specify the sources of uncertainty in your data gathering, handling and calculations

Scope	Uncertainty range	Main sources of uncertainty	Please expand on the uncertainty in your data
Scope 1	More than 2% but less than or equal to 5%	Data Gaps Assumptions Extrapolation Data Management	Although great effort was made to ensure completeness and accuracy by using internal spreadsheets with controls and responsible parties; due to the large scope of the organisation, it is expected that some discrepancies could have occurred in the data collection and supply from the various divisional facilities of the company. Fuel consumed in owned equipment was derived from purchase records and not metered consumption. Data used to calculate the emissions from the vehicle fleet and forklifts consisted of litres of petrol and diesel and kilograms of LPG purchased.
Scope 2	More than 2% but less than or equal to 5%	Data Gaps Extrapolation Metering/ Measurement Constraints	In South Africa electricity charges are based on meters owned and maintained (calibrated) by Eskom or the municipalities. Some countries and divisions have missing data and available data was extrapolated to reflect consumption for a full year.

CC8.6

Please indicate the verification/assurance status that applies to your reported Scope 1 emissions

Third party verification or assurance complete

CC8.6a

Please provide further details of the verification/assurance undertaken for your Scope 1 emissions, and attach the relevant statements

Type of verification or assurance	Attach the statement	Page/section reference	Relevant standard	Proportion of reported Scope 1 emissions verified (%)
Limited assurance	https://www.cdp.net/sites/2015/56/12656/Climate Change 2015/Shared Documents/Attachments/CC8.6a/Nampak Limited 2014 Verification Statement.pdf	Pages 1-3	ISO14064-3	100

CC8.6b

Please provide further details of the regulatory regime to which you are complying that specifies the use of Continuous Emissions Monitoring Systems (CEMS)

Regulation	% of emissions covered by the system	Compliance period	Evidence of submission

CC8.7

Please indicate the verification/assurance status that applies to your reported Scope 2 emissions

Third party verification or assurance complete

CC8.7a

Please provide further details of the verification/assurance undertaken for your Scope 2 emissions, and attach the relevant statements

Type of verification or assurance	Attach the statement	Page/Section reference	Relevant standard	Proportion of reported Scope 2 emissions verified (%)
Limited assurance	https://www.cdp.net/sites/2015/56/12656/Climate Change 2015/Shared Documents/Attachments/CC8.7a/Nampak Limited 2014 Verification Statement.pdf	Pages 1-3	ISO14064-3	100

CC8.8

Please identify if any data points have been verified as part of the third party verification work undertaken, other than the verification of emissions figures reported in CC8.6, CC8.7 and CC14.2

Additional data points verified	Comment
Year on year change in emissions (Scope 1)	Total Scope 1 emissions decreased by 5 623.21 tCO2e or 3.53% when compared against 2013, mainly as a result of a decrease in diesel consumption.
Year on year change in emissions (Scope 2)	Total Scope 2 emissions increased by 28 999.96 tCO2e or 4.68% when compared against 2013 as a result of increased emission factors as the activity variable decreased by 0.5% for the same period.
Change in Scope 1 emissions against a	The increase in Scope 1 emissions of 24.02% when compared against the base year (2009) can be attributed to

Additional data points verified	Comment
base year (not target related)	the inclusion of African operations.
Change in Scope 2 emissions against a base year (not target related)	Scope 2 emissions increased by 4.68% when compared against the base year (2009) as a result of the inclusion of the UK, Isle of Man and African operations.

CC8.9

Are carbon dioxide emissions from biologically sequestered carbon relevant to your organization?

No

CC8.9a

Please provide the emissions from biologically sequestered carbon relevant to your organization in metric tonnes CO2

Further Information

Page: CC9. Scope 1 Emissions Breakdown - (1 Oct 2012 - 30 Sep 2013)

CC9.1

Do you have Scope 1 emissions sources in more than one country?

Yes

CC9.1a

Please break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by country/region

Country/Region	Scope 1 metric tonnes CO2e
South Africa	131496.33
Africa	27992.98

CC9.2

Please indicate which other Scope 1 emissions breakdowns you are able to provide (tick all that apply)

By activity

CC9.2a

Please break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by business division

Business division	Scope 1 emissions (metric tonnes CO2e)

CC9.2b

Please break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by facility

Facility	Scope 1 emissions (metric tonnes CO2e)	Latitude	Longitude

CC9.2c

Please break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by GHG type

GHG type	Scope 1 emissions (metric tonnes CO2e)

CC9.2d

Please break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by activity

Activity	Scope 1 emissions (metric tonnes CO2e)
Stationary combustion	147602.48
Mobile combustion - forklifts	3988.51
Mobile combustion - vehicle fleet	3078.11
Air conditioning and refrigerant gas refills (Kyoto protocol gases)	4820.21

CC9.2e

Please break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by legal structure

Legal structure	Scope 1 emissions (metric tonnes CO2e)

Further Information

Page: CC9. Scope 1 Emissions Breakdown - (1 Oct 2013 - 30 Sep 2014)

CC9.1

Do you have Scope 1 emissions sources in more than one country?

Yes

CC9.1a

Please break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by country/region

Country/Region	Scope 1 metric tonnes CO2e
South Africa	132203.57
Africa	21662.53

CC9.2

Please indicate which other Scope 1 emissions breakdowns you are able to provide (tick all that apply)

By activity

CC9.2a

Please break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by business division

Business division	Scope 1 emissions (metric tonnes CO2e)

CC9.2b

Please break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by facility

Facility	Scope 1 emissions (metric tonnes CO2e)	Latitude	Longitude

CC9.2c

Please break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by GHG type

GHG type	Scope 1 emissions (metric tonnes CO2e)

CC9.2d

Please break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by activity

Activity	Scope 1 emissions (metric tonnes CO2e)
Stationary combustion	139616.23
Mobile combustion - forklifts	3885.32
Mobile combustion - vehicle fleet	3441.45
Air conditioning and refrigerant gas refills (Kyoto protocol gases)	6923.10

CC9.2e

Please break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by legal structure

Legal structure	Scope 1 emissions (metric tonnes CO2e)

Further Information

Page: CC10. Scope 2 Emissions Breakdown - (1 Oct 2012 - 30 Sep 2013)

CC10.1

Do you have Scope 2 emissions sources in more than one country?

Yes

CC10.1a

Please break down your total gross global Scope 2 emissions and energy consumption by country/region

Country/Region	Scope 2 metric tonnes CO2e	Purchased and consumed electricity, heat, steam or cooling (MWh)	Purchased and consumed low carbon electricity, heat, steam or cooling accounted for in CC8.3 (MWh)
South Africa	575662.59	636826.92	0
United Kingdom	37507.07	84194.73	0
Isle of Man	7.75	23.41	0
Africa	6607.74	17830.74	0

CC10.2

Please indicate which other Scope 2 emissions breakdowns you are able to provide (tick all that apply)

CC10.2a

Please break down your total gross global Scope 2 emissions by business division

Business division	Scope 2 emissions (metric tonnes CO2e)

CC10.2b

Please break down your total gross global Scope 2 emissions by facility

Facility	Scope 2 emissions (metric tonnes CO2e)

CC10.2c

Please break down your total gross global Scope 2 emissions by activity

Activity	Scope 2 emissions (metric tonnes CO2e)

CC10.2d

Please break down your total gross global Scope 2 emissions by legal structure

Legal structure	Scope 2 emissions (metric tonnes CO2e)

Further Information

Page: CC10. Scope 2 Emissions Breakdown - (1 Oct 2013 - 30 Sep 2014)

CC10.1

Do you have Scope 2 emissions sources in more than one country?

Yes

CC10.1a

Please break down your total gross global Scope 2 emissions and energy consumption by country/region

Country/Region	Scope 2 metric tonnes CO2e	Purchased and consumed electricity, heat, steam or cooling (MWh)	Purchased and consumed low carbon electricity, heat, steam or cooling accounted for in CC8.3 (MWh)
South Africa	599094.49	632044.37	0
United Kingdom	42957.44	86912.65	0
Isle of Man	7.77	23.27	0
Africa	6725.41	16938.20	0

CC10.2

Please indicate which other Scope 2 emissions breakdowns you are able to provide (tick all that apply)

CC10.2a

Please break down your total gross global Scope 2 emissions by business division

Business division	Scope 2 emissions (metric tonnes CO2e)

CC10.2b

Please break down your total gross global Scope 2 emissions by facility

Facility	Scope 2 emissions (metric tonnes CO2e)

CC10.2c

Please break down your total gross global Scope 2 emissions by activity

Activity	Scope 2 emissions (metric tonnes CO2e)

CC10.2d

Please break down your total gross global Scope 2 emissions by legal structure

Legal structure	Scope 2 emissions (metric tonnes CO2e)

Further Information

Page: CC11. Energy

CC11.1

What percentage of your total operational spend in the reporting year was on energy?

More than 0% but less than or equal to 5%

CC11.2

Please state how much fuel, electricity, heat, steam, and cooling in MWh your organization has purchased and consumed during the reporting year

Energy type	MWh
Fuel	703232.30
Electricity	660721.99
Heat	0
Steam	75196.50
Cooling	0

CC11.3

Please complete the table by breaking down the total "Fuel" figure entered above by fuel type

Fuels	MWh
Brown coal	57260.95
Diesel/Gas oil	74661.82
Kerosene	9.17
Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG)	475117.91
Liquefied petroleum gas (LPG)	88060.94
Motor gasoline	8121.51

CC11.4

Please provide details of the electricity, heat, steam or cooling amounts that were accounted at a low carbon emission factor in the Scope 2 figure reported in CC8.3

Basis for applying a low carbon emission factor	MWh associated with low carbon electricity, heat, steam or cooling	Comment
No purchases or generation of low carbon electricity, heat, steam or cooling accounted with a low carbon emissions factor	0	

Further Information

Page: CC12. Emissions Performance

CC12.1

How do your gross global emissions (Scope 1 and 2 combined) for the reporting year compare to the previous year?

Increased

CC12.1a

Please identify the reasons for any change in your gross global emissions (Scope 1 and 2 combined) and for each of them specify how your emissions compare to the previous year

Reason	Emissions value (percentage)	Direction of change	Comment
Emissions reduction activities	1.06	Decrease	Scope 1 total emissions decreased by 5 623.21 tCO2e or 3.53% mainly as a result of emission reduction activities to reduce diesel consumption. Although Scope 2 emissions increased, electricity and steam consumption (kWhs) reduced by 0.42% as a result of energy efficiency initiatives.
Divestment			
Acquisitions			
Mergers			
Change in output			
Change in methodology	4.06	Increase	The emissions factor for purchased electricity from Eskom (Scope 2) increased by 5.10% or from 0.98 in 2013 to 1.03 kg CO2e per kWh in 2014.
Change in boundary			
Change in physical operating conditions			
Unidentified			
Other			

CC12.2

Please describe your gross global combined Scope 1 and 2 emissions for the reporting year in metric tonnes CO2e per unit currency total revenue

Intensity figure	Metric numerator	Metric denominator	% change from previous year	Direction of change from previous year	Reason for change

Intensity figure	Metric numerator	Metric denominator	% change from previous year	Direction of change from previous year	Reason for change
0.0000401918	metric tonnes CO2e	unit total revenue	6.91	Decrease	Despite a 3% increase in Scope 1 & 2 emissions as a result of an increased emission factor for SA electricity (4.06%), offset by emission reduction initiatives (1.06%), the intensity figure for revenue decreased as a result of a 10.64% increase in revenue earned. The 2013 revenue earned was restated in the 2014 AFS to exclude the divestment of Cartons & Labels.

CC12.3

Please describe your gross global combined Scope 1 and 2 emissions for the reporting year in metric tonnes CO2e per full time equivalent (FTE) employee

Intensity figure	Metric numerator	Metric denominator	% change from previous year	Direction of change from previous year	Reason for change
89.04	metric tonnes CO2e	FTE employee	6.69	Increase	The intensity figure per FTE increased as a result of a reduction in FTEs of 3.46% and a 3% increase in Scope 1 & 2 emissions as a result of an increased emission factor for SA electricity (4.06%), offset by emission reduction initiatives (1.06%).

CC12.4

Please provide an additional intensity (normalized) metric that is appropriate to your business operations

Intensity figure	Metric numerator	Metric denominator	% change from previous year	Direction of change from previous year	Reason for change
0.6099724822	metric tonnes CO2e	square meter	1.65	Decrease	Despite a 3% increase in Scope 1 & 2 emissions as a result of an increased emission factor for SA electricity (4.06%), offset by emission reduction initiatives (1.06%), the intensity figure per m2 decreased as a result of a 4.73% increase in area of operations.

Further Information

Page: CC13. Emissions Trading

CC13.1

Do you participate in any emissions trading schemes?

No, and we do not currently anticipate doing so in the next 2 years

CC13.1a

Please complete the following table for each of the emission trading schemes in which you participate

Scheme name	Period for which data is supplied	Allowances allocated	Allowances purchased	Verified emissions in metric tonnes CO2e	Details of ownership

CC13.1b

What is your strategy for complying with the schemes in which you participate or anticipate participating?

CC13.2

Has your organization originated any project-based carbon credits or purchased any within the reporting period?

No

CC13.2a

Please provide details on the project-based carbon credits originated or purchased by your organization in the reporting period

Credit origination or credit purchase	Project type	Project identification	Verified to which standard	Number of credits (metric tonnes of CO2e)	Number of credits (metric tonnes CO2e): Risk adjusted volume	Credits cancelled	Purpose, e.g. compliance

Further Information

Page: CC14. Scope 3 Emissions

CC14.1

Please account for your organization's Scope 3 emissions, disclosing and explaining any exclusions

Sources of Scope 3 emissions	Evaluation status	metric tonnes CO2e	Emissions calculation methodology	Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners	Explanation
Purchased goods and services	Relevant, calculated	277.03	Consumption of office paper Emission factors: Mondi Rotatrim Paper Profile and Sappi Typek Paper Profile - released July 2014 and February 2014 respectively indicating electricity usage and CO2 emissions per tonne of paper. Tonnes of paper purchased provided by the service providers were used to calculated emissions according to the GHG Protocol using the provide emission factors. Assumptions: Data of paper purchased is recorded centrally for Nampak's South African divisions and not at a divisional level.	100.00%	
Capital goods	Not relevant, explanation provided				Emissions from capital goods are captured under Scope 1 &2, e.g. generators, vehicle fleet and any electricity consuming equipment.
Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scope 1 or 2)	Not relevant, explanation provided				All fuel and energy consumed in operations are reflected in Scopes 1 & 2.
Upstream transportation and distribution	Relevant, calculated	6906.06	Outsourced third-party transport Litres of diesel and kilometres travelled in third party vehicles were used to calculate emissions according to the GHG Protocol using Defra's 2014 emission factors for fuel and delivery vehicles. Assumptions: Data for the outsourced transport was available for Nampak Plastics - UK and Kenya only. Fuel consumed by third party vehicles was calculated using the available records.	100.00%	
Waste generated in operations	Relevant, not yet calculated				
Business travel	Relevant, calculated	5199.05	Business travel in rental cars, commercial airlines, hotel accommodation Car rental - kilometres travelled, car	100.00%	

Sources of Scope 3 emissions	Evaluation status	metric tonnes CO2e	Emissions calculation methodology	Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners	Explanation
			engine size and type of fuel used provided by service provider. Defra's 2014 emission factors for passenger vehicles used. Air travel - flight information provided by service provider, including class of travel, departure dates and destination of each leg. Carbon Calculated determined the distance travelled. Defra's 2014 emission factors for business travel - air used. Hotel accommodation - bednights provided by service provider. Emissions factor sourced from UNEP World Meteorological Organisation Climate Change And Tourism Report; A2.2.3 Accommodation. Emissions were calculated according to the GHG Protocol. Assumptions: All fights are booked through the company therefore there are no privately booked flights that are not accounted for. Hotel accommodation was based on estimated number of nights away on business travel and calculations were based on 1 person occupying a room per night. Data is reported centrally for Nampak's South African divisions and not at a divisional level.		
Employee commuting	Relevant, not yet calculated				
Upstream leased assets	Not relevant, explanation provided				Many forklifts are leased although managed by Nampak including purchasing of fuel. It was not possible to establish which forklifts were owned and which were leased, thus all forklift fuel was recorded as Scope 1.
Downstream transportation and	Not relevant, explanation				Nampak Plastics – UK and Kenya outsourced and paid for their third

Sources of Scope 3 emissions	Evaluation status	metric tonnes CO2e	Emissions calculation methodology	Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners	Explanation
distribution	provided				party transport, which is reflected in Upstream transportation and distribution.
Processing of sold products	Not relevant, explanation provided				Nampak's products are not intermediate products that require further processing. It is not responsible for directly generating greenhouse gas emissions.
Use of sold products	Not relevant, explanation provided				Nampak's products are final products do not produce direct or indirect use-phase emissions from fuel or electricity use.
End of life treatment of sold products	Relevant, not yet calculated				
Downstream leased assets	Not relevant, explanation provided				If applicable, all emissions from these sources are captured in other sections.
Franchises	Not relevant, explanation provided				Nampak does not have franchised operations.
Investments	Not relevant, explanation provided				Nampak accounts for emissions on the equity share approach.
Other (upstream)					
Other (downstream)					

CC14.2

Please indicate the verification/assurance status that applies to your reported Scope 3 emissions

Third party verification or assurance complete

CC14.2a

Please provide further details of the verification/assurance undertaken, and attach the relevant statements

Type of verification or assurance	Attach the statement	Page/Section reference	Relevant standard	Proportion of Scope 3 emissions verified (%)
Limited assurance	https://www.cdp.net/sites/2015/56/12656/Climate Change 2015/Shared Documents/Attachments/CC14.2a/Nampak Limited 2014 Verification Statement.pdf	Pages 1-3	ISO14064-3	100

CC14.3

Are you able to compare your Scope 3 emissions for the reporting year with those for the previous year for any sources?

Yes

CC14.3a

Please identify the reasons for any change in your Scope 3 emissions and for each of them specify how your emissions compare to the previous year

Sources of Scope 3 emissions	Reason for change	Emissions value (percentage)	Direction of change	Comment
Purchased goods & services	Change in output	0.19	Increase	Economic activity and revenue increased in 2014 by 10.64% resulting in increased paper usage.
Upstream transportation & distribution	Change in output	6.89	Increase	Economic activity and revenue increased in 2014 by 10.64% resulting in increased emissions from outsourced transport.
Business travel	Emissions reduction activities	0.01	Decrease	Emissions from travel in rental cars have decreased during 2014 as a result of behavioural changes resulting in fewer business trips.

CC14.4

Do you engage with any of the elements of your value chain on GHG emissions and climate change strategies? (Tick all that apply)

No, we do not engage

CC14.4a

Please give details of methods of engagement, your strategy for prioritizing engagements and measures of success

CC14.4b

To give a sense of scale of this engagement, please give the number of suppliers with whom you are engaging and the proportion of your total spend that they represent

Number of suppliers	% of total spend	Comment

CC14.4c

If you have data on your suppliers' GHG emissions and climate change strategies, please explain how you make use of that data

How you make use of the data	Please give details

CC14.4d

Please explain why you do not engage with any elements of your value chain on GHG emissions and climate change strategies, and any plans you have to develop an engagement strategy in the future

No formalised methods of engagement exist, however environmental factors are taken into account with suppliers as far as possible (more related to services being supplied).

In the UK the entire industry is involved in reducing the environmental impact to achieve the Dairy Roadmap's target of 30% rHDPE inclusion in packaging by 2015 resulting in the launch of Nampak's Infini® bottle in 2013.

In future the possibility does exist for strategic discussions with service providers, and potential service providers. For instance, focus could be placed on the environmental awareness of the goods purchased – particularly in the instance of paper and travel.

Further Information

Module: Sign Off

Page: CC15. Sign Off

CC15.1

Please provide the following information for the person that has signed off (approved) your CDP climate change response

Name	Job title	Corresponding job category

Name	Job title	Corresponding job category
Lynne Kidd	Group Compensation, Benefits and Sustainability Manager	Environment/Sustainability manager

Further Information

CDP 2015 Climate Change 2015 Information Request